

Amdt. Dated May 16, 2006

Appl. No. 10/734,753  
Reply to Office Action of February 24, 2006

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appl. No. : 10/734,753 Confirmation No. 1973  
Applicant : Dennis R. Morrison  
Filed : December 9, 2003  
TC/A.U. : 2877  
Examiner : Nguyen, Tu T.  
  
Docket No. : MSC-23277-1  
Customer No. : 24957

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

**I. BACKGROUND**

(A) Date of interview: May 5, 2006, approximately 10:30 am EST  
  
(B) Type of interview: Telephonic  
  
(C) Name of participant(s): Examiner Tu T. Nguyen and Applicant's attorney Kurt G. Hammerle

**II. SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW**

(D) Brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted:  
None  
  
(E) Identification of the claims discussed: Pending claims 1-2 and 4-28

(F) Identification of the specific prior art discussed: Rowe (U.S. Pat. No. 4,075,462) and Schwartz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,610,256)

(G) Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed: None

(H) General thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant: The Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under his new ground of rejection for independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 25 and the claims that depend on these four independent claims (2 and 4-9, 11-17, 19-24, and 26-28, respectively). As given in M.P.E.P. § 2143, the Examiner must establish some suggestion or motivation, either in the cited references of the hypothetical combination of Rowe, Ortyn, and Schwartz, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to modify the hypothetical combination or to combine the cited reference teachings. The Applicant respectfully suggests that the cited references fail to teach the necessary suggestion or motivation as explained in the Response to Second Non-Final Office Action filed concurrently with this Interview Summary.

(I) Indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement: No agreement as to the patentability of the claims was reached.

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE INTERVIEW**

The Interview did not result in resolution of the issues pending in this matter.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

The Applicant respectfully submits that the requirement for a proper record of an Examiner Interview as required by M.P.E.P. § 713.04 has been fulfilled by this Examiner Interview Summary.

The Examiner is invited to contact Kurt G. Hammerle, attorney for the Applicant, at 281-483-1001, if in his opinion such a telephone interview would serve to expedite the prosecution of this patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: MAY 16, 2006

By: Kurt G. Hammerle

Kurt G. Hammerle, Reg. No. 36,819

Attorney for the Applicant

NASA Johnson Space Center  
Mail Code AL  
2101 NASA Parkway  
Houston, TX 77058  
Telephone: 281-483-1001  
Facsimile: 281-483-6936